

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 24 to correct a minor grammatical error. Claims 1 and 24 are independent.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in the interview of November 17, 2008. Independent claims 1 and 24 were discussed as was Rezaiifar (U.S. Publication). Applicants' representative argued that Rezaiifar alone or in combination with Rose, does not teach or suggest the claimed two cryptosyncs. The Examiner indicated that this appeared to be correct, but would have to re-evaluate upon the filing of a response.

**Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 1 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar et al. (U.S. PG. Pub. No. (2003/0206538) in view of Rose et al. (U.S. PG. Pub. No. (2004/0218763). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "deriving a value of a first cryptosync for the communication session, the first cryptosync having a life limited to the communication session, based on a value of a second cryptosync, the second cryptosync having a life extending over multiple

communication sessions.” As discussed during the interview, Rezaiifar does not teach or suggest a first cryptosync value derived from a second cryptosync value. The cited paragraphs of Rezaiifar, [0041]-[0042] teach deriving the same cryptosync at both a sender and a receiver. Applicants submit that the cryptosync in Rezaiifar has the same value and therefore Rezaiifar does not teach or suggest a value for a first cryptosync being derived from a second cryptosync value.

In addition, even if the cryptosync derived at the sender and receiver could be considered different cryptosyncs, both “cryptosyncs” are used over a single communication session. Applicants submit that independent claim 1 recites “the second cryptosync having a life extending over multiple communication sessions,” which is clearly not taught by Rezaiifar. Further, Rose does not cure the deficiencies of Rezaiifar.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 24 are allowable over Rezaiifar individually or in combination with Rose.

Claims 2-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rezaiifar et al. (U.S. PG. Pub. No. (2003/0206538) in view of Rose et al. (U.S. PG. Pub. No. (2004/0218763) and further in view of Rezaiifar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,980,658) (Rezaiifar ‘658). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-23 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants submit that Rezaiifar ‘658 does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of

Rezaiifar and Rose as discussed above. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection and indication that dependent claims 2-23 are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-24 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

Julie E. Stein, Reg. No. 43,158

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/JES